

**To:** Gildea, Jason[Gildea.Jason@epa.gov]  
**Cc:** Laidlaw, Tina[Laidlaw.Tina@epa.gov]; DalSoglio, Julie[DalSoglio.Julie@epa.gov]  
**From:** Shari Johnson Engineering  
**Sent:** Wed 10/1/2014 10:02:10 PM  
**Subject:** RE: Rethinking Columbia Falls

Sure thing. More discussion is really good. There are other reasons Polson is upgrading, so that may be true of others. But the uncertainty and lack of emphasis (that they hear at least) on the non-point sources, is a common theme I hear from all the communities. The new information about trading not penciling out for Whitefish was bad news too. I'm happy to share what I hear out there behind the scenes.

**Shari Johnson, PE**

**Shari A Johnson & Associates Engineering, PLLC**

**406-261-3019**

**From:** Gildea, Jason [mailto:Gildea.Jason@epa.gov]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 01, 2014 3:34 PM  
**To:** Shari Johnson Engineering  
**Cc:** Laidlaw, Tina; DalSoglio, Julie  
**Subject:** RE: Rethinking Columbia Falls

Hi Shari,

Thanks for following up!

I think there is still a lot of confusion surrounding the nutrient criteria/variances/etc, and I think it would be a good idea to have a follow up call or meeting with Tina Laidlaw (and/or DEQ) to dispel some of these myths.

For example, you used Polson and Forsyth as examples of treatment plants that had to spend millions to “meet the DEQ nutrient criteria”. I don’t think that is the case for either of those WWTPs. Perhaps both need to upgrade for other reasons though?

Anyways, I think that we should chat soon. Specifically, I am concerned as to why municipalities in the Flathead are at an emotional and financial breaking point. It seems to me that several of them are confused about how the lake TMDLs and/or permitting process will impact their facility. I think that a quick discussion could clear up some of the misconceptions.

Jason

**From:** Shari Johnson Engineering [<mailto:sajengineering@centurylink.net>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 30, 2014 9:19 AM  
**To:** Gildea, Jason; [mbostrom@mt.gov](mailto:mbostrom@mt.gov)  
**Subject:** Rethinking Columbia Falls

Good Morning Jason, I thought about CFalls on the way home and what you were saying makes sense. I’m sorry for any confusion I created. The intent of the message I wanted to portray was that point sources are bearing a large and continually growing financial burden when the non-point sources aren’t. And that it appears (at least at the lake level) that the point sources aren’t as significant of contributors as non-point sources.

I believe you and Mark are correct that non-point source regulation just isn’t going to happen at the state level. But if we are going to make a difference in water quality something needs to be done. Mark, can you send me the information you were talking about on local authority to regulate non-point sources and any examples in progress (and hopefully successful ventures). The municipalities are reaching a breaking point (emotionally and financially) and anything we can do to show that all pollution contributors are being treated equally will help. Maybe this group can pursue this avenue.

Thanks for attending and your help!

**Shari Johnson, PE**

**Shari A Johnson & Associates Engineering, PLLC**

**406-261-3019**